In fact, the traditions of the Shilluk tells us of hostile relations between them and the Fung, and their first encounter, as was stated above, was on a battlefield. It is quite logical that, as the Fung extended their dominion across the White Nile to the Dabo mountains and the Sue'afon, the Shilluk were also -for a time- incorporated in the Fung dominion. 72) We must not exempt the Shilluk from sharing the same fate with other Negro and Negroid neighbouring tribes. Many of the members of these tribes were transplanted to the Sennar area, forming the bulk of the Fung armies. It is reasonable that these people gave their old village names to the new villages where they were living in service of the Fung Empire. Shilluk were among the Sennar armies, and Bruce rightly said that Shillukes are the troops of the king. And owing to the extreme cleverness and haughtiness of a Shilluk, it is not possible to explain the existence of Shilluk in the Fung army, or the transplantation of these Shilluk outside their country as an act of free will on the part of the Shilluk, or as free lancers serving the military ambitions of their deadly foe. The Shilluk must have been compelled to such acts under coercive conditions. We must always bear to mind that the Shilluk were facing a better organized enemy, with cavalry, which was totally unknown warfare equipment to the Shilluk. The Shilluk may have been excellent in using their tactics of surprise attacks, and on relatively isolated groups, but should this tactic succeed against organized armies with cavalry?

Recorded in the Shilluk songs are many pieces describing the frequent Arab slave raids, the havoc they played with the Shilluk, and prayers to the Shilluk former kings and ancestors to help them against the marauders. How could it be possible then to understand the situation arising from the assumption of a Shilluk origin of the Fung, or the statement of Arkell telling us that the governor of El-Abd was ruling the Shilluk relatives on the White Nile? How could it be possible that the Fung could forget their origin and loot their relatives, subduing them to slaves or concubines? And if the Fung did not themselves raid the Shilluk on account of alleged blood-relationship, why did they not afford them protection against Arab raids if we know that the Arab raiders are included in the Fung domain?

The other report upon which Arkell leaned was the killing of kings in Sennar, and the resemblance of this habit with that which prevails among the Shilluk. But we have invalidated this statement upon qualitative grounds.

If kings of Sennar were killed lawfully by a royal executioner, which in itself is not a fact agreed upon, they were killed on a totally different basis from that which was practiced among the Shilluk. Furthermore, we know that Shilluk kings were either suffocated, or clubbed to death, but with the Fung, a king

---

72) Arkell, (3), p. 17. He states that "The Fung Kingdom at its prime included most of the present Sudan, from Kurmuk in the north to Beni Shangul and the Shilluk country in the south ..."